




Tinker Creek Subwatershed







Botetourt Roanoke Bedford Roanoke City Salem Tinker Creek Subwatershed Developed, Medium Intensity County Developed, Open Space REGIONAL SOCK Emergent Herbaceuous Wetlands Waterbodies Evergreen Forest — Streams Herbaceuous Landuse Categories Mixed Forest Barren Land Cultivated Crops Pasture/Hay Deciduous Forest Sources: USGS, VADEQ, ESRI Projection: NAD 1983 UTM Zone 17N Shrub/Scrub Developed, High Intensity Developed, Low Intensity

Impairment Summary

Assessment Unit	Stream Name	Length (miles)	Boundaries	Cause
VAW-L05R_TKR01A00	Tinker Creek	5.34	Tinker Creek mainstem from its confluence with the Roanoke River upstream to the mouth of Carvin Creek.	Escherichia coli
VAW-L05R_TKR01B06	Tinker Creek	6.54	Tinker Creek mainstem from the Carvin Creek mouth upstream to the confluence of Buffalo Creek.	Escherichia coli
VAW-L05R_TKR02A00	Tinker Creek	4.34	Tinker Creek mainstem from the mouth of Buffalo Creek upstream to the Roanoke City diversion tunnel located just upstream of the USGS stream gaging station.	Escherichia coli
VAW-L05R_TKR03A00	Tinker Creek	3.12	Tinker Creek mainstem from the Roa- noke City diversion tunnel to Carvin Cove on upstream to its headwaters.	Escherichia coli

Land Use Distribution (NLCD 2006)

	Arc	ea
Land Use Category	Acres	Percent
Developed	9,171.3	35.8%
Agriculture	7,245.6	28.3%
Forest	9,068.3	35.4%
Water/Wetlands	50.5	0.2%
Other	58.6	0.2%
Total	25,594.4	100.0%

Existing and Allocated Bacteria Loads

Land Use/Source	Total Ann Loads (billi forming u	Percent Reduction	
	Existing Load	Allocation Load	(%)
Land Based Non-point	Loau	Load	
Developed	519,671	8,192	98.4%
Agriculture	3,541,809	5,567	99.8%
Forest	267,947	10,558	96.1%
Water/Wetlands	768	30	96.1%
Other	1,572	25	98.4%
Direct Non-point			
Livestock Direct	18,537	0	100.0%
Wildlife Direct	4,123	1,030	75.0%
Failed Septic, Straight Pipes and Sewer Overflows	190,661	0	100.0%
Point Source	0	0	0.0%
MS4s	1,004,709	15,837	98.4%
Total	5,549,797	41,239	99.3%

Existing Best Management Practices Agricultural and Stormwater


Agricultural Best Management Practice		Area Treated	Streamlength Protected (ft)
CREP Grazing land protection	1	1.7	763
CREP Riparian Forest Buffer Planting	3	9.0	N/A
Harvestable Cover Crop	1	47.4	N/A
Nutrient Management Plan Implementation and Record Keeping	3	36.0	N/A
Permanent Vegetative Cover on Cropland	2	10.1	N/A
Protective cover for specialty crops	1	13.7	N/A
Riparian Buffer Rent	3	9.0	N/A
Small Grain cover crop for Nutrient Management	24	326.4	N/A
Stream Exclusion With Grazing Land Management	6	174.9	5,913
Streambank protection (fencing)	1	6.0	5,600
Total	45	634	12,276

Stormwater Best Management Practice	Count	Reporte Treat (acr	ted*
Bioretention	1	52.	.2
Detention Basin	46	476	5.3
Infiltration	8	No E	D ata
Manufactured Unit	3	1.4	4
Porous Pavement	1	0.2	2
Retention Pond	6	20.	.4
Underground Detention Basin	4	2.2	2
Water Quality/Grassed Swale	1	52.	.2
Wet Pond	3	167	'.0

*Not all Best Management Practices reported area treated

The municipalities are in the process of creating Best Management Practices inventories, so not all Best Management Practices present in the watershed may be reported.

Existing Bacteria Load Distribution



Potential Implementation Actions to Reduce Bacteria

- . Improved Pasture Management
- . Waste Storage Facilities
- . Livestock Exclusion from Streams
- . Riparian Buffer Creation/Expansion
- . Low Impact Development Stormwater Controls
- . Septic System Repair/Replacement
- . Educational Programs
- . Pet Waste Disposal Systems